Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 3, 5 - 13, 15 - 23 and 25 - 32 are presently pending in the application. Claims 4, 14 and 24 were previously canceled. New claim 32 has been added. As it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their previously presented form, the claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

On page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 - 2, 5 - 12, 15 - 22 and 25 -31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 6,388,997 to Scott ("**SCOTT**") in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0109228 to Muller et al ("**MULLER**"). On page 12 of the Office Action, claims 3, 13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **SCOTT**, in view of **MULLER**, and further in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141478 to Ozluturk ("**OZLUTURK**").

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections. More particularly, the combination of prior art, cited in the Office Action, fails to teach or suggest Applicants' particularly claimed invention.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 31 recite, among other

limitations:

> a transmitter of said base station being configured to
> transmit first data bursts to said mobile stations, at
> least some of the first data bursts containing at
> least two data blocks intended for different ones of
> said mobile stations, **said transmitter being
> configured to produce identification information for
> said piconetwork only at a start of a transmission of
> each of the first data bursts;**
> [emphasis added by Applicants]

Applicants' independent claim 11 requires, among other

limitations:

> **first data bursts** transmitted from the base station to
> the mobile stations, with at least some of said first
> data burst containing at least two data blocks, each
> of said data blocks being intended for different
> mobile stations, and further **containing identification
> information for the piconetwork only at a start of
> each of said first data bursts;**   [emphasis added by
> Applicants]

Applicants' independent claim 21 recites, among other

limitations:

> (a) **transmitting a first data burst** from the base
> station to the mobile stations, the first data burst
> containing at least two data blocks each intended for
> a different one of the mobile stations, **including
> transmitting identification information for the
> piconetwork only at a start of a transmission of the
> first data burst;**   [emphasis added by Applicants]

As such, all of Applicants' claims require, among other

limitations, **transmission of a first data burst including**

identification information for the piconetwork <u>only</u> at the

start of the transmission of the first data burst.

Page 4 of the Office Action acknowledges that the **SCOTT**

reference fails to teach or suggest the above-limitations of

Applicants' claims, stating, in part:

> However, Scott does not specifically disclose piconet
> and that the identification information is placed only
> at the start of the data burst.

Rather, page 4 of the Office Action goes on to point to **MULLER**

as allegedly disclosing a piconet and identification

information being placed only at the start of the data burst.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree that the **SCOTT** and

MULLER references can be properly combined to teach or suggest

Applicants' claimed invention. Rather, the **SCOTT** and **MULLER**

references cannot be combined to show Applicants' claimed

invention **without impermissibly destroying** the teachings of

those references.

More particularly, page 4 of the Office Action pointed to the

Access Code of Fig. 3 of **MULLER**, and paragraphs [0008] and

[0009] of **MULLER**, as allegedly disclosing identification

information being placed <u>only</u> at the start of the data burst.

Paragraphs [0008] and [0009] of **MULLER**, state:

Applic. No. 10/629,948
Response Dated August 29, 2008
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

Referring to FIG. 3, a typical radio packet 30 is illustrated. The radio packet has a start 32 and contains three distinct portions: a first portion contains an Access Code 34, a second portion contains a Header 36 and a third portion contains a Payload 38.

The Access Code is a series of symbols used in the network to identify the start of a radio packet and effect synchronisation and DC estimation. It has a fixed length. **The Access Code used in normal communication is the Channel Access Code which identifies the network and is included in all packets exchanged in the piconet.** [emphasis added by Applicants]

Additionally, paragraph [0004] of **MULLER**, states, in part:

When the master unit is performing point-to-point communication a transmitted radio packet is addressed to a particular transceiver which replies to the master unit by transmitting a radio packet addressed to the master unit in the next available time slot. Any time misalignment between the master and a slave is corrected by adjusting the timing of the slave. [emphasis added by Applicants]

As can be seen from paragraphs [0004], [0008] and [0009] of **MULLER**, Fig. 3 of **MULLER** discloses a conventional data burst (30 of Fig. 3) including data **dedicated to one, particular transceiver** (i.e., " . . . a transmitted radio packet is addressed to **a particular** transceiver . . . "). Thus, **MULLER** fails to teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicants' claims, a "first data burst containing **at least two data blocks each intended for a different one** of the mobile stations".

Page 16 of 21

Rather, page 4 of the Office Action points to **the base station**

burst 571 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** as allegedly corresponding to

Applicants' claimed first data burst containing at least two

data blocks each intended for a different one of the mobile

stations. However, **SCOTT** discloses that the base station

burst 571 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** is made up of a plurality of

individual data packets (574 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT**), <u>each</u> of

which data packets 574 <u>must</u> **include a preamble** (577 of Fig. 5C

of **SCOTT**) and data dedicated to multiple mobile stations (578

of Fig 5C of **SCOTT**). See, for example, col. 20 of **SCOTT**,

lines 39 - 47, which state:

> **During the transmission portion 571, the base station**
> **304 transmits to a plurality of user stations 302**
> **during a plurality of transmit time slots 574. In each**
> **transmit time slot 574,** rather than sending a message
> directed to a single user station 302, **the base**
> **station 304 sends an interleaved message 578**
> **containing a sub-message 589 for each of the user**
> **stations 302** (or a sub-message 589 for general polling
> or other functions if the receive time slot is
> unoccupied).

See also, for example, col. 21 of **SCOTT**, lines 4 - 12, which

state:

> **In** <u>each</u> **transmit time slot 574,** preceding the
> interleaved message 578 **is a preamble 577.** The
> preamble 577 assists the user station 302 in
> synchronization, and may comprise a spread spectrum
> code. **Preambles 577 appear in each transmit time slot**
> **574** <u>**and are dispersed throughout the transmission**</u>
> <u>**portion 574,**</u> therefore allowing the user station 302
> to support channel sounding operations useful for
> setting up a rake receiver (e.g., synchronization)

and/or selection diversity.   [emphasis added by
Applicants]

Clearly, as can be seen from col. 21 of **SCOTT**, **SCOTT** teaches
including **in <u>each</u> burst 571, a plurality of time slots 574,
wherein preambles 577 appear in each transmit time slot 574
<u>and are dispersed throughout the transmission portion 574</u>**.
Thus, **SCOTT** clearly teaches that the preambles <u>**cannot**</u> appear
"**<u>only</u> at a start of a transmission of the first data burst**",
as required by Applicants' claims, but rather, **preambles <u>must</u>
appear in <u>each</u> time slot of the data burst and <u>are dispersed</u>
<u>throughout the transmission portion 574</u>** of **SCOTT**.

To modify **SCOTT** as suggested in the Office Action (i.e., to
include only <u>**one**</u> preamble <u>**at the start**</u> of the data burst 571
of **SCOTT**) would impermissibly destroy the teachings of **SCOTT**
requiring <u>**each**</u> time slot 574 of the burst 571 of **SCOTT** to
include preambles 577 of **SCOTT dispersed <u>throughout</u> the**
transmission portion 574 of **SCOTT**.   As such, **SCOTT** not only
teaches a person of ordinary skill in the art <u>**away**</u> from
Applicants' claimed invention, but any modification to **SCOTT**
that would cause it to read on Applicants' claimed invention
would <u>**impermissibly destroy**</u> the teachings of **SCOTT**.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, the **SCOTT** reference
cannot be modified in the manner suggested in the Office

Action. The **OZLUTURK** reference, cited in the Office Action in combination with **SCOTT** and **MULLER** against certain of Applicants' dependent claims, does not cure the above discussed deficiencies of the **SCOTT** and **MULLER** references. Applicants' claims are, therefore, believed to be patentable over **SCOTT, MULLER** and **OZLUTURK**, whether taken alone, or in combination.

Additionally, Applicants have added new claim 32 to the present application. New claim 32 depends from claim 1 and recites, among other limitations:

> . . . wherein the time slot of one of the first data bursts corresponds to an integer multiple N of the time slot of one of the second data bursts, N being equal to the number of mobile stations.

Support for new claim 32 can be found in the specification of the instant application, for example, on page 19 of the instant application, lines 5 - 10, which state:

> In order to make it possible to compare equation (1) with the equation (2), it is assumed that the time slot TBMb for a first data burst according to the exemplary embodiment illustrated in FIG. 3 is the same as the N times time slot TBMa.

In the present application, TBMa corresponds to the time slot of the first data burst, while TBMb corresponds to the time slot of the second data burst. See, for example, page 15 of the instant application, lines 17 - 22.

As stated above, page 4 of the Office Action analogizes the basestation burst 571 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** to Applicants' particularly claimed first data burst and mobile bursts 572 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** to Applicants' particularly claimed second data burst. However, it can be seen from Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** that the time slot of the burst 571 of **SCOTT** does <u>not</u> correspond to an integer multiple of the time slot of the burst 572 of **SCOTT**, as required by Applicants' new claim 32. Rather, from Fig. 5C of **SCOTT**, it can be seen that the time slot of data burst 572 of **SCOTT** (the second data burst) is <u>greater</u> than the time slot of the data burst 571 of **SCOTT** (the first data burst), due to additional gap times between the data packets 575 of the mobile bursts 572 of **SCOTT**. As such, Applicants' new claim 32 is believed to be further patentable over the prior art references cited in the Office Action.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32. Claims 1, 11, , 31 and 32 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1, 11 or 21.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of

claims 1 - 3, 5 - 13, 15 - 23 and 25 - 32 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims

to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a

telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can

be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition

for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to

Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner

Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Kerry P. Sisselman
Reg. No. 37,237

For Applicants

August 29, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101